

SECRET

DD/S 68-4526

83/57

3 SEP 1968

ILLEGIBLE

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : Administrative Authorities

REFERENCE : Your memorandum of 26 June 1968 (DBS 68-2265)

1. The following are my views regarding the proposals listed in the referent memorandum and further described in the attachment to it:

a. (Proposal No. 4)

To Be Resolved

This proposal would seem to permit an employee to change his place of residence, for purposes of travel and transportation benefits, even though an actual change of residence has not taken place. My inclination is to favor a policy which permits authorization of travel and transportation expenses from the employee's post to the place where he was actually residing at the time of his departure for the post or at the time of his appointment, whichever is appropriate, or to a place not more distant.

✓ b. (Proposal No. 5)

If the cited provision of the present regulation was intended to mean, or is being interpreted to mean, that the Agency will pay travel and transportation expenses of an employee retiring abroad to any place in the world, I agree that it should be changed.

SECRET

SECRET

✓ c. (Proposal No. 6)

Concur.

✓ d. (Proposal No. 7)

I concur in the recommendation that Agency regulations specify that the normal tour of duty overseas will be 24 months in duration unless some other period is prescribed for a particular post or for employees at the post who are in specified grades. I believe the responsible Deputy Director should prescribe the tour of duty or that his concurrence should be required.

✓ e. (Proposal No. 8)

I do not agree with the proposal. It would inject considerations of intended future residence which it would be most difficult to determine with equity. I would have no objection to some clarification of the present regulation, particularly if this would simplify its administration, but I believe it is already sufficiently liberal. We would like to have the present policy retained. However, we believe should be amended to provide that initial designation as well as redesignation of home leave points must have the concurrence of the Deputy Director concerned as well as the approval of the Director of Personnel.

25X1A

SECRET

SECRET

✓ f. (Proposal No. 9)

Concur.

g. (Proposal No. 10)

To be resolved by OCS/RCB/SSS

I agree that establishment of eligibility for home leave and for the home service transfer allowance should be correlated at headquarters with the processing of the field reassignment questionnaire. As of now, however, I do not agree with the proposal for a separate certificate to be completed by the field employee, at the time he prepares his field reassignment questionnaire, and forwarded to headquarters. It would appear to be sufficient for the regulation to clearly specify the requisite conditions for approving home leave and the home service transfer allowance, including a determination by the Career Service that it is contemplated that the employee will return to service outside the United States. Since determination of the future assignments of an employee is the prerogative of his Career Service, it would follow that the Career Service should determine whether the employee is likely to return to service outside the United States. It seems inappropriate to require the approval of the Director of Personnel for such determinations.

h. (Proposal No. 11)



25X1C

✓ i. (Proposal No. 12)

Repealed

I have no objection to this proposal, but I do not plan to delegate the authority as indicated.

SECRET

2. The concurrences noted above should be understood to be concurrences in principle. We would want to have an opportunity to review and comment on the particular provisions which are later drafted to express the proposals and related procedures in regulatory form.

/s/ Thomas H. Karamessines

Thomas H. Karamessines
Deputy Director for Plans

SECRET